

Draft

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

The meeting of the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO) was held on **THURSDAY, April 14, 2005, AT 1:00 P.M.** The following members were present: Morris Dunlap, Chair, Harold Warner Jr. Vice-Chair; Darrell Downing; Bill Johnson; Bud Hentzen; Ronald Marnell; Elizabeth Bishop; James Barfield, Denise Sherman, Frank Garofalo, Jay Banasiak, Chris Herrick, and Jeff Bridges, M.S. Mitchell, John W. McKay Jr., Gary Gibbs, Mayor Bruce Armstrong Jim Singletary and Ray Fleming were not present. Staff members present were: John L. Schlegel, MAPD Director, Jamsheed Mehta, Transportation Planning Manager, Nancy Harvieux, Principal Planner, and Valerie Robinson, Recording Secretary.

❖ WAMPO ITEMS

1. The meeting was called to order by Mr. Dunlap, Chairman of the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.

DUNLAP, We do not have a quorum, so we'll take Item #4 out of order for non-action items.

2. Approval of Minutes of the March 24, 2005 meeting.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the March 24, 2005 Minutes.
WARNER motioned, JOHNSON 2nd Motion (11-0) Motion carries

3. Adopt the final Intelligent Transportation System/Regional Architecture Version 1 9ITS/RA); Presented by Jamsheed Mehta

DUNLAP This item on our Agenda is an important one; we need to adopt the final Transportation System Regional Architecture Version 1.

MEHTA planning staff presenting item. On March 10th, you set the Public Hearing Date for today and you also identified a comment review period, which concluded on March 31. We have had some changes to the document and have identified those very briefly. We did not change anything materially or significantly for you to make any changes to. Just an update; I have a few slides on what this is about and its relationship to the big picture of transportation. Consultants have been hired, ITERIS will help develop the Regional Architecture, it is required by law; in fact the Federal deadline to have it completed was last week April 8th, we are concluding it the following week because we extended our comment period to ensure that everyone was covered. What we are going to ask you is to adopt this, and open for a Public Hearing, then close it and then vote to adopt. Volume 1 is the only item needing a vote at this time. There are two additional components that are not that critical but they are part of the overall ITS Architecture; Volume 2 - how will we implement these various architecture concepts and Volume 3 - how to make sure that the communication systems between the various entities will work out. This large document you received in the mail is only Volume 1 and it is the paper version of architecture. Here is the idea, somebody is doing a study on signals or a study on connecting 911 dispatch centers to the various traffic operation centers, they hire a consultant, the consultant will not have to go and visit all 60 stakeholders in the region, they go to the Regional Architecture in an electronic database form, they will already know who will need to be connected. They only need identify if there are any significant changes to be recognized. This is the beauty of having architecture in place, so that new consultants don't do the same thing that we are doing all over again. In Volumes 2 and 3 we will bring to you at the end of May for final approval. Here is the relationship of this document, the Regional ITS Architecture; is housed within the MPOs Planning process, only because it is so conducive, it leads to ITS related projects which gets into the Long Range Plan, which can be programmed with real dollars in the TIP to be implemented. Even if Agencies outside of this Planning Department identify projects, that is fine, they can go ahead and get it funded provided that it is linked back and based on the Regional ITS Architecture, it is like the Long Range Plan, if a project is not in the Long Range Plan you cannot get federal funding or certain types of funds associated with this, the same rule applies to a signal project or any of these projects which have Intelligent Transportation Systems spelled out on it. We have completed workshops; we've had several 3-day workshops not just on Architecture but also started on the Implementation and Communication Plans. We have done 1-day workshops to exclusively finish Emergency Management Services. On March 10, we had the MPO Executive Overview; that same morning we had Executive Sessions with all communities, not just with the MPO. We also had an MPO Public Meeting, not that well attended but we had press coverage leading out of it.

What is this all about; see document in packet called Executive Summary Version. Architecture links and Centers, there are different types of centers to field equipment, which in turn links to vehicles, which in turn can lead to individuals who want information. This is an overly simplified graphic of what kind of components are involved. The details of each one is a separate page in the handout that you have. Here is an example, this would be flows of information to Wichita Public Works, if they have a Traffic Operation Center, they are getting information from the Roadside Equipment, they are getting information from KDOT's Traffic Operation Center, which would be co-located in the new 911 building of the county, KDOT Roadside Equipment, this is just one example of several that are in the document as presented. All of this was done in a workshop environment over several days with key staff members who deal with this kind of information on a day-to-day basis. All planning staff did was make sure the coordination occurred. This is not our plan, this is the plan of all our 60 Stakeholders. I am getting the 60 Stakeholders from the number of individuals that have been involved at some stage in this ITS Architecture Development. Next steps; on May 12th, we will present Volumes 2 & 3; we will establish a Comment Period from May 6th thru the 25th, we will again come back to you on the 26th to adopt the remaining two volumes and that will complete the whole project.

DUNLAP have we already established that Public Comment period, May 6th thru 25th?

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MARCH 24, 2005

MEHTA, no you have not.

DUNLAP, are we doing that today?

MEHTA, yes you could. Sure.

DUNLAP but that is not our action item right now?

MEHTA correct, I think we are meeting one more time in April before that if you like.

SCHLEGEL normally you would do that on May 12th when you're presented with Volumes 2 & 3.

MEHTA because of the overlap, May 12th is after May 6th we thought we would start the Comment Period on the document; make it available but do you a presentation on May 12th. I am not sure if that is in violation of any rules, but if it is we can back off on it.

DUNLAP those two dates is what I was concerned about, if we needed to establish that Public Hearing Comment today or if we could wait until May 12th to do it retroactive for 6 days.

MEHTA sure, as long as we have the word out in the press; that we have a Comment Period and that the document is available. When you talk about May 6th, is the time when we are mailing out/or may have already mailed it out to you so it is official.

DUNLAP, are there any comments from the new WAMPO members; any questions on this?

BANASIAK so May 26th is when; if everything goes right after May 26th federally, the Federal Government will be ok with the ITS Architect?

MEHTA, correct mostly okay with it as of today's action, after you are done with the Public Hearing part of it, but there are the other two volumes that are also needed to complete the full document. Yes

MARNELL, I prefer to set the May 6th and 26th date today and not do it retroactive.

DUNLAP okay, we will address that after while.

BRIDGES one comment that Jamsheed and I talked about was about the graphic content on page 39, it shows the future links between the 911 Center and Andover, they are not here today but (can't hear rest of discussion)

DUNLAP we had a small discussion earlier about that and that is a major item, thank you Jeff I had forgotten to mention that.

MEHTA in fact that graphic and that section is the revision to the main document between March 10th when you last saw it because Andover identified they had signal systems that needed to be shown as having some connectivity. Eell we will revise it if that is okay with you to show it as dash lines rather than existing lines.

DUNALP at this point we will now open for Public Comment Section for Volume 1 Architecture document for the Wichita Sedgwick County Regional Intelligent Transportation System, anyone in the audience wishing to address us on this item, anyone wanting to speak on this item? We close the Public Hearing on this item and now the action is for the WAMPO members to Adopt Volume 1, if you so desire to do that.

MARNELL I move that we adopt Volume 1 of the Architecture Document for the Sedgwick County Regional Intelligent Transportation System.

Motion to I move that we adopt Volume 1 of the Architecture Document for the Sedgwick County Regional Intelligent Transportation System.

Dunlap Motioned, Bishop 2nd the motion (11-0) Motion carried

DUNLAP, all in favor of the adoption signify by saying aye? Any opposed? Motion carries. Lets go to the other item the Public Hearing. Do we have a motion?

MARNELL I will make the motion,

DUNLAP, we have a motion to establish a Public Comment date starting on May 6th.

MOTION: To establish a Public comment date starting May 6th..
Marnell motioned, Bridges 2nd Motion (11-0) motion carries

4. Status report on the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update; presentation by Jamsheed Mehta.

(Item #4 taken out of order for lack of quorum) Barfield, Hentzen, Sherman, Dunlap, Garofalo, Bishop, Marnell and Jeff Bridges and Jay Banasiak are present. (Johnson in at 1:11) (Warner in at 1:18) .

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MARCH 24, 2005

As you are aware, we have been synthesizing information received from the public and interested stakeholders, in the LRTP update process. Currently there are a number of items of interest that we would like to bring to your attention.

1. Modeling activities of capacity projects and other network initiatives.
2. Rail Road Corridor Growth regionally/nationally.
3. Trans Texas Corridor (TTC) potential impact.
 - TTC-35 Corridor.
 - I-69 Corridor.

JAMSHEED MEHTA, Planning Staff Presenting Item #4 on the MPO Agenda, it is a non-action item but we will take input from you. We have had Public Input Meetings, and had 2 Advisory Committees meetings, from various group, and stakeholders. The Consultants team has done one-on-one interviews with Stakeholders, they are winding down to a point where we have a sense of what individual stakeholders might need, or would like to see explored. We will begin modeling some of the ideas, some cannot be modeled but rather it is a policy related item and we would bring that to you as well. Some are significant and I would like to identify so that you are aware of what has been mentioned. Some are old issues but they are significant, we need to bring them back to the table. Old issues include: The Big Ditch crossings, and unsettled issue between Wichita and Sedgwick County; the Council has changed significantly since City Council voted on it where the study was done on this particular issue. At that time the preference was; do programming for 29th Street, which connects to 25th, before doing anything on 13th Street. However the study that was done reflected the need for both. It is in the current Long Range Plan that both big ditch projects are identified, in fact it says in the plan that if one has to identify the differences of which goes first, the current plan says make it 13th because it will solve today's problem.

Railroad separations had been discussed over several years. The City has some projects ongoing, but there are so many more to be done, associated with that I will have a brief presentation on railroad related issues. Interchange Improvement again old issues but we need to identify in the modeling process, which interchanges would be important, more so now because in this 2030 Transportation Plan you have 2 time frames, in Near Term which we will call the 2015 the first 10 years and then the remaining 15 years up to the long term 2030 horizon years, which would be your priorities, which interchanges should be your priorities as well. Northwest Bypass design is on going, it is under design, this time next year when the design is complete the remaining sections of the right-of-way will be acquired for corridor preservation, but what is the effect of having the facility in our region will be again be documenting it as part of this Long Range Plan Update, likewise the South Area Transportation Study. There will be a separate study that looks at it from a different standpoint, which is the Economic Development, but this Long Range Plan will at least address the circulation and traffic flow implications of having such a facility in this region. We went to Topeka and received comments from KDOT items we received from them: Corridor Preservation which means the Northwest Bypass is also an endorsement of the South Area Study if that is supported in the next few years, but what about preserving the corridors integrity as it is right now for example; K-96 from Maize out to Mount Hope, it is an expressway, the 3rd bullet down - converting expressway to freeway improvements, but it is also related to the first bullet. How do you preserve that corridor for serving mobility, because accidents rates are climbing, traffic volumes are climbing up, what kinds of tools do we have or do we need additional authority to be able to do that kind of corridor preservation. Likewise K-254 Study is just being started between the cities that are within Butler County and Sedgwick County for the 254 Corridor. It is right now based on land use and economic development but the State is very interested in knowing what are the implications on the highway system because it is the reason why we are doing a study; there is a highway their already, so those factors put together plus a few more that the State identified they would want to see in this plan as considered. Some are your favorites, you mentioned a few times the second bullet down the I-235, US-54 and Central Interchange something that we did not get funded for in the last System Enhancement Project from 5 years ago, it will be in the Long Range Plan if you keep it there as a significant study and a significant project. In fact there is a separate fund identified at nearly 4 and 1/2 million dollars to do the study aspects of this. It had been studied in the past and we are going to redo it again under a different perspective. This group has already identified item #4, the 4th bullet down the 235, K-96 and 135, why isn't that at 6 lane section like it is as you go out further, it takes it out towards the county line. 47th Street has been studied by the City of Wichita jointly with the State, that study has been concluded and it has some recommendations on it. There is no funding behind it but if this plan supports it then there is additional funding we can identify a construction source for that, I-35 north that is what I already mentioned, 6-lanes. This is what we have from KDOT, which is encouraging, most what we identified as significant and issues on the existing system they also recognized it in that meeting.

DUNLAP, as we look at additional development north and west, straddling 96, do they have a plan to change that from expressway to freeway?

MEHTA, no they don't but they are very cautious about the study that has just kicked off between the various cities along K-254 going along out to Butler County. Whatever those land use and economic incentives might be out of that land use Economic Development Study, will induce some kind of change on the traffic circulation. Can you have at grade intersection every mile the way it is right now, or does it need to go for interchanges and if so will there be frontage roads and various concepts, how do you preserve the integrity of the highway system is what I think they are looking at.

DUNLAP is it up to you to get the information on the K-254 study that is going on to KDOT. Is there another or is that the only avenue to get that study information to KDOT?

MEHTA no, in terms of having a copy they do have it and will be participating in the K-96 study. Yes they are on top of that, how they include some of that information into this Long Range Plan is what we are going to work with now.

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MARCH 24, 2005

DUNLAP I was just concerned that they weren't out there planning one direction while Unruh and his group are building in a different direction.

MEHTA they are very much aware of this, I think they are partners on this to some extent.

DUNLAP, thank you.

BARFIELD, how many of these projects have funding associated with it right now?

MEHTA, On the first one it is a very generic term, Corridor Preservation there is funding for the Northwest Bypass, 3 million between City and County, Wichita and Sedgwick County, and 4 to 6 million in that range from the State when they run out of money from that pool I'm not sure what else can be identified. They don't have corridor preservation funds for other highways but at least that one was identified. The second bullet down there is money for a study 4 1/2 million dollars of federal funds, it will not take any local funds to make that happen. Nothing for the Expressway, Freeway improvement, but having said that Kellogg, parts of Kellogg are an expressway and if there is any funding in the CIP, then that is already their, but you don't have it for the radial corridors that are going in and out of the metro area. Nothing on the last 3 bullets, it is a funding wish list that has been identified; it has been studied enough, no actual construction money.

BARFIELD, so this priority could be re-arranged?

MEHTA, there is not order to it this it is randomly put in.

BISHOP I am a little bit confused about the streets, I assume that I-35 north of 37th Street means 37th Street South?

MEHTA north. I-135, right that should have been, 135, you are correct.

BISHOP, that should be 135, what about 47th street?

MEHTA that is south, that is the one, which says, "last free interchange" before you hit the turnpike if you are heading south.

BISHOP, that is 135 that branches off from 35?

METHA, 135 it ends at that interchange and it becomes the turnpike from there on.

BISHOP I had a previous slide I had the same question about 63rd Street and I-35.

MEHTA, that would be in the Derby vicinity, Derby identified that if there was a connection of 63rd, now 63rd is coming all the way from Butler County, from Rose Hill, it is already scheduled for 4-lane widening into the City of Derby, most of it is a Sedgwick County Project. Then it does not go and connect to I-35, which is Turnpike. The only way residents of Derby would be able to access the Turnpike is to go to the Haysville side from 63rd go south, or go South towards 81st and come up Grand Avenue or 71st right across their corporate limits. A suggestion would be for us to be examining concepts with the Kansas Turnpike, they will always have their reservation and we have been told they have studied this concept years ago and it wasn't feasible from their perspective, the turnpikes perspective. We asked the question was it because financial feasibility or was their not enough traffic volumes to justify it and we would like to model it in our own modeling environment rather than rely on the turnpike to do it for us which would give us different results this time.

BISHOP, I might suggest that you consider putting north and south in the information that would help us.

MEHTA, yes we will, we take it for granted when certain highway get called out.

GAROFALO what is happening with the South Area Study?

MEHTA South Area will kick off very shortly, we have funding identified for a while, and we are burdened with so many other projects going on that starting a new one would spread us real thin.

GARAFALO was it discussed at all at the KDOT meeting?

MEHTA yes, they are aware of it, in fact the funding arrangement is that it is all federal funds, but as federal funds go you usually need a match to go with it, a 20% match; we are going to seek the KDOT soft match, they have what is called "toll credits" which can be used as match towards federal projects, federally funded projects so they are the ones supplying us with the soft match, to go ahead with that study.

DUNLAP any further question from Jamsheed; continue.

MEHTA switching gears we talked about railroads; sort of a different picture, our railroads and our seaports as we are learning and listening from different sources we found out that they are congested. More and more with freight coming in from overseas to ports like Long Beach, Los Angeles is getting congested; or the railroads taking freight out of there is getting congested, a person I visited with said it takes 6 days when taken out on a truck from one of these ports on the west coast to come towards Kansas but it takes nearly 14 days for the railroads and most of it is not commute time; it is congestion in the yards and trying to move so much freight out of those areas. And even then it is the capacity of how much traffic can these railroads handle on the existing lines. Just

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MARCH 24, 2005

looking at the graphic it appears that; if you look at where Wichita and South Central Kansas is located on this, and this is an unscientific way of trying to make the point; what the railroads seem to be focusing on is Wichita, and South Central Kansas as a extremely super opportunity for them to be able to do things here to increase the frequency of their freight from moving. We have 2 class-one railroads, UP and the BNSF. We have both of their lines running through here and it is constantly increasing. A year ago we were told that in the short term they would increase by 10 to 15 % per year for the next few years in terms of rail traffic. On the highways its 4% a year at the high end, 1 to 2 % per year is a rule of thumb. The railroads are saying 10% to 15 % but some of the folks at KDOT said even more than that in some cases. So they are going to look at our area, even though we think we have got too many trains already, from their perspective, the railroad operations perspective it is not enough. They are not using full capacity and even then they would like to speed things up by adding double track and move freight differently. Point being, what we are trying to do is raise your level of awareness and maybe get something out of this body that would lead to another study. A group of people from the railroad industry could be visiting with us to find out what are the long-term goals over here, because if you don't react to it, or if you don't take this seriously we will be having more trains. Two things that are happening, and we notice those here, I will come back to the graphic, but one is the trains are increasing the train length, when you see a real long train, it is 1 mile long usually, they are called unit trains, now they are going to 2-mile long trains as the new way to move things. The increase in frequency, talking about 10, 15, or even 20 % growth per year that is the frequency at which it will grow. The increase in the number of rail tracks, I will go back to the previous slide, which is a zoomed out version to tell you where we are. This is Wichita and this is Sedgwick County so you can see Harvey County, Marion County, Butler and all these places; you have got UP railroad lines and BNSF lines that cross and they again cross over here in Wichita and then the BNSF crosses another BNSF track over here and UP goes the other way. What I am trying to say is if you are considering things like intermodal freight operation locations from a regional perspective beyond just Wichita and Sedgwick County, there are some excellent locations, they are not close to Sedgwick County like this one for example looks like it is in Harvey County, could be in Marion County as well, but from a large REAP perspective perhaps, Regional Area perspective, there are those locations that could be ultimately explored as well. All this means more train traffic in our region. Back to our own graphic over here again we need to react because of safety implications. Right now we have 3 miles of track that is going to be elevated from south of 21st street going to downtown. From a railroad perspective that means they don't have to be at 20 mile per hour they can be at 29 to 30 miles per hour. Ultimately when they make improvements further on 21st that even allows them to increase the speed for the long distance. Railroads make a difference even at 2 to 3 miles per hours; that is significant in the long run because they are rather congested and every minute helps. So bottom line for all of this is that the Long Range Plan needs to have a recommendation that looks at the Railroad issues but not necessarily from the perspective of this boundary but include all the players who would be in the larger area, because from a railroad perspective, the solution may be way outside our planning jurisdiction.

Another quick point to draw your attention to this is that some of us like myself for example heard about it for the first time when I read it in the newspaper here locally, this is something going on in Texas for the last so many years and it is taken very seriously and going way ahead of where we thought it would be by now. The Trans Texas Corridor initiated by Texas DOT and has the support of the Texans, the governor and a lot of other cities and towns, all of them are metro areas that are involved in it, their issues are they have rapid growth and traffic congestion, they have safety issues, they have too many trucks and the trucks are mingling with way to many cars. It is a bottleneck situation almost entirely between Austin and the Dallas area. So they are thinking about this nearly quarter mile wide corridor from one of the Mexico boarders all the way through to circumvent some of the established cities through which I-35 goes through right now. So wherever it come to a congested area it deviates and does a bypass, when it does that it opens up new area for economic growth. It is not really solving just today's problems it is doing one more thing, it is causing Economic Development to occur in new areas that did not have a chance before, which is the reason why I am even bringing these slides up for you. If it is simply diverting traffic away or around the metro area, that is an internal thing, that is fine, but when they link all these highways at the Texas boarder with Oklahoma, then it is expected that additional traffic would want to go up further north and the question is; where; would Wichita be able to benefit from it or would we be impacted, then we need to do something about it to take advantage of that situation; this highway is pretty much going to happen the way it sounds. It does not have any Federal funding in it. Most of it is private funding from an entity in Texas and an entity in Spain and these two have formed this consortium along with Tex DOT and it is a 7.2 billion dollar project. It could follow either one of these alignments which goes through the Austin, San Antonio, Dallas concept or as an alternate to it being considered as one that sorts of bends towards the Houston area following the Gulf Coast. If that were to be a final option then we don't have much of that impact on us because it is going to the Texarkana Border, Shreveport, Louisiana is pretty close by there, but it is a similar concept. Quite likely it is going to be the one that is going through the Dallas area because that was the original concept and that is where most of the power struggle is right now it seems. Like I said there is no federal money which is the reason why there has not been enough coordination between TxDot, Oklahoma DOT, Kansas DOT, but that needs to happen. So we are recognizing it here, we are asking the State to be involved in it, that we can then benefit from their involvement rather than the Wichita MPO on its own and see what we can learn, include that in the Long Range Plan, and have an ongoing relationship with them so we can benefit from it. There are two Federal funds already identified, one for the City of Wichita and one for the Kansas World Trade Center Inc. They have a little over a million dollars each to do what could be an intermodal type study, but it is a study to identify freight movements through this area. All of those funds and all of those study activities could be identified in such a way that we can take advantage of whatever comes out of this. This time next year the Federal Highway will have approved the alignment and they would ask the private individuals and TxDOT to start acquisition of the corridor, so this is happening, this is real money that is already lined up. They will use toll facilities to recover the cost and it is a 50-year project; after that I don't know maybe it gets free again. This is FYI for you, this is big and you need to be concerned about this.

Back to the world of Wichita Area MPO the Public Meeting date, the next meeting date has been set, just this morning we did that, the evening of May 25th and 26th, two consecutive days of the second round of public meetings, we had our first round in March, and this round we will be asking our consultant to present all of those ideas that have been gathered, that have been modeled and analyzed and see what they look like and ask people to react to it. So on the 26th, of May when we are here which is a month from now, we will ask you also to share your impression about the various considerations that have been added to the project list. We will continue to do the modeling efforts as I mentioned earlier and we will return back to you with updates.

WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MARCH 24, 2005

DUNLAP that is the status of the Long Range Transportation Plan, now we need to return to our agenda; we have a quorum let's look at the minutes.

5. Other items.

DUNLAP other items Jamsheed if you have other items could we put those on the next Agenda?

MEHTA, we sure can.

6. Adjournment.

DUNLAP is there anything else to come before the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization? I am going to call for a motion that we adjourn.

MOTION: Motion to Adjourn the WAMPO meeting
DUNLAP motioned, > 2nd Motion, all in favor (11-0) motion carries

The Metropolitan Area Planning Organization Meeting adjourned at 1:48 P.M.

State of Kansas)
Sedgwick County) ss

I, John L. Schlegel, Director of the Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan Area Planning Department, do hereby certify that the foregoing copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, held on _____, is a true and correct copy of the minutes officially approved by the Policy Body.

Given under my hand and official seal this _____ day of _____, 2005.

John L. Schlegel, Director
Wichita-Sedgwick County Metropolitan
Area Planning Department

(SEAL)